

Case 7:14-cv-00106-JPJ-PMS Document 84 Filed 01/19/16 Page 1 of 3 Pageid#: 597

demanding, Magistrate Judge Sargent filed a Report and Recommendation on September 25, 2015. The Report found that Webb had not proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Broyles purposely accused him falsely of violating his Common Fare Diet Agreement or that Broyles personally removed him from that diet.

Webb filed timely objections to the Report, which objections are ripe for decision. He objects to the Report's finding that Broyles' testimony was the more credible and attempts to discredit Broyles and other defense witnesses in various ways. Webb also objects to the hearing itself and to the court's refusal to appoint counsel for him. Webb now claims that he had demanded a jury trial, had unresolved discovery issues, and did not understand the need to marshal and present his trial evidence before the magistrate judge.

I have carefully reviewed Webb's objections, his additional evidence, and pertinent parts of the record. I have also conducted de novo review of the witness testimony as reflected in the unchallenged transcript of the trial evidence.<sup>1</sup> I conclude that the evidence presented supports the magistrate judge's factual findings and legal conclusions on which she relied in recommending judgment for the defendant on both claims. I further find that the court's docket does not reflect

---

<sup>1</sup> In performing a de novo review, the court must exercise "[its] non-delegable authority by considering the actual testimony, and not merely by reviewing the magistrate's report and recommendations." *Wimmer v. Cook*, 774 F.2d 68, 76 (4th Cir. 1985) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

that any party served a timely demand for a jury trial, that Webb's motions for appointment of counsel and all discovery matters were appropriately resolved, and that the court's orders adequately advised Webb of the nature of the bench trial proceeding.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Objections by Plaintiff are OVERRULED;
2. The Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 75) is hereby ACCEPTED; and
3. A separate Judgment will be entered in favor of Defendant Broyles.

ENTER: January 19, 2016

/s/ James P. Jones  
United States District Judge